

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-7 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 15-21 have been newly added herewith.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Prophet (U.S. Patent No. 5,413,743).

Claims 1, 3 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Walsh (U.S. Patent No. 4,654,761).

Finally, claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Prophet or Walsh.

The Examiner maintained the above rejections in an Advisory Action dated October 16, 2006. However, Applicants continue to disagree with the Examiner's rejections and traverse them as follows.

On page 2 of the October 16 Advisory Action, the Examiner provides a justification for maintaining the rejection of the pending claims. However, the Examiner's note is somewhat confusing and it appears as though the Examiner misinterprets claim 1. For example, the Examiner states that "the boundary surface is just an offset portion between the protruding portion of the second resin layer and a first resin layer spaced there from." It thus appears as though the Examiner misinterprets the recitation of boundary surface by giving it little weight. Also, the Examiner appears to believe that the claimed offset relates to the first and second resin layers being spaced from one another. However, the boundary surface is clearly recited and

should be given patentable weight. Also, there is nothing to suggest that the boundary surface relates to the first and second resin layers being spaced from one another. Rather, the boundary surface is a boundary surface between the first and second resin layers, is at the protruding portion and is offset relative to the back side of the second resin layer adjacent to the protruding portion.

A structure consistent with the claimed invention is shown in the non-limiting embodiment of Fig. 3. As shown in Fig. 3, there is a boundary surface 25 between laminated first and second resin layers 26, 24 at a protruding portion 24b. The boundary surface 25 is offset δ from a surface of the resin layer 24 adjacent to the protruding portion 24b. Prophet and Walsh clearly lack a structure similar to the claimed structure or the structure of the non-limiting embodiment shown in Fig. 3. For example, rather than having a boundary surface (element 25 in the non-limiting embodiment) between the resin layers at a protruding portion, Prophet and Walsh have resin layers which are spaced apart. While the Examiner asserts that the wavy surfaces of Prophet and Walsh constitute protruding portions, the Examiner has failed to explain how he believes that there is a boundary surface between laminated first and second resin layers at the wavy surfaces. Indeed, rather than having a boundary surface between resin layers, the resin layers of Prophet and Walsh are spaced apart, as acknowledged by the Examiner (compare the space of Prophet and Walsh to the boundary surface 25 of the non-limiting embodiment). This spacing apart is evidence of lack of a boundary surface, not a showing of a boundary surface, let alone a boundary surface as set forth in claim 1. Prophet and Walsh simply lack the

claimed structure which includes a boundary surface between first and second resin layers as claimed.

In view of the above, claim 1 is allowable at least because the Examiner has failed to identify any boundary surface between laminated first and second resin layers as claimed. Claims 3, 5 and 7 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency.

With respect to claim 4, even if Prophet or Walsh were modified as suggested by the Examiner, the modification would not correct the above-noted deficiencies of those references with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, claim 4 is submitted to be allowable at least because of its dependency. Furthermore, even if the Examiner's alleged offset was relevant, the Examiner provides no motivation for providing any particular offset value, let alone the particular offset value range recited in claim 4.

New Claims

Claims 15-21 have been newly added herewith in order to provide a more varied scope of protection. Claim 15 is allowable at least because of the recitation of a boundary surface which is offset relative to the back side of a second resin layer. Claims 16-21 depend from claim 15 and are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.114(c)
U.S. APPLN. NO. 10/825,682

DOCKET NO. Q81126

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen R. Valancius
Registration No. 57,574

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 13, 2006